

CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance
Vol. XXXVI No. 2 Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper February, 1985

COURTING DISASTER

by Rosine de Bouneville

Whenever there is a so-called conservative government in this country, we seem to hear so great a deal about Law and Order that one feels they must be spelled with capital letters. It is not that Tories enact more Parliamentary Bills than their opposite numbers do when they are in power. Socialist governments become equally busy repealing Tory legislation and/or substituting as much more of their own — (in their case) all in the cause of Law and Justice for all. Well, perhaps not quite all — more for the working class, shall we say. Either way, there is an awful lot of law. We use that expression advisedly, for it is really awe inspiring to contemplate what “new, improved” orderly societies parliamentarians are forever telling us they will achieve by passing laws calculated to regulate our lives and deaths, according to the latest “scientific” fad, literally from “womb to tomb”. This procedure, despite every resultant national disaster, is no longer confined to sovereign states. Today, we have *inter-national* law makers, operating in European Courts and Common Market Courts. Tomorrow, presumably, we shall all be subject to legal judgement in World or even Universal Courts. This legalising exercise has been the major pre-occupation of politicians for so long that one can only suppose that the successive generations of legislators have had no time to look beyond the confines of their chosen — to adapt a phrase — Houses of Correction. If they ever did so, they could not help but see the increasing chaos that obtains among the generality of those who (in this country) are often alluded to as most law-abiding citizens. Such an anomalous situation screams for recognition and remedy. However, we might say if laws lead only to chaos, what remedy is there? There would, of course, be none if the only law were that which has been visited upon us in such profusion of detail for as long as most of us can now remember — but it is not.

The mistake we have made — or rather the lie that has been taught us as truth — is that law is an invention of socially responsible humanity: the crowning achievement of Man-evolved-from-primeval-slime. It is nothing of the kind. “Quite above our touch,” as a Georgette Heyer character might say

when denying acquaintanceship with some classic tome. Only the arrogance of evolutionary thought clings to the notion that alone we did it. But even supposing the Leakey logic could somehow be made to hold the concept of the progressive invention of the fitter to the fittest, it would still be necessary to explain where those little jellies in the mud secreted the ability and *will* to embark upon their millenia of tortuous experimentation on the road to *Homo Sapiens*. That surely must be a bit of a puzzle to those who spend their palaeontological lives measuring the brains of baboons.

Creationists Have It Right

So we shall take it that the evolutionists have it wrong. In that case, the creationists have it right, and God *did* fashion everything out of nothing. *And* He saw that it was good. So, there were Man and Woman, created by God, and privileged to walk and talk with Him in an environment of irreproachably ordered beauty. Whatever happened to that natural law and order? Believe it or not, we have been told. One attribute God has given to Man that He withheld from the animals is free will, and anyone who has endured a friend's unwanted assistance whilst trying to solve a crossword puzzle will understand what a divinely unique gift that is!

With all that, our first parents had not been here for five minutes before they did the one thing that could send them to exile for life. By one deliberate act of rebellion they shattered forever the spiritual and mental perfection they were created with and, again relatively speaking, half-an-hour more and their descendants had ruined the physical world as well; their wickedness brought the Deluge down on their heads. Ever since, Nature has remained as bent as Man himself. So complete was his alienation from the pristine flow of Divine grace that only the Source Himself could restore it. For this the Second Person of the Triune God became Man and died to make Himself the new channel of grace. That is the Missing Link we have to discover. Without Him we can only blunder from chaos to chaos as our history shows, never more plainly than today.

Increasingly, statute books are laden with laws designed to help us to flout the Divine Will with a

clear conscience: the "what is legal can't be wrong" syndrome. Everything from blasphemy and baby-murders to natural and unnatural vice is permitted, if not encouraged. Race relations law has forced what was once a Christian country to grant equal presentation to every other form of worship however idolatrous or bizarre. Legalisation for unnatural vice has put our cities on a par with those of "the plain", with even more horrific side-effects than we ever learned of from the Bible. The unrestrained operation of usury is really the root and trunk of this dreadful tree since love of money fertilises the otherwise sterile soil in which it grows. Deal with money and the legislators will take care of themselves.

To be effective of order, nations' laws must parallel the commandments of God, as did the Common Law of England before it was dishonoured in the name of Democracy. Order will never devolve from a set of paid agitators sitting in comparative safety for eight months of the year, passing laws so numerous,

complicated and sometimes unethical that they can neither be remembered nor enforced.

When all permissive legislation is repealed (who needs permission to do what is right?), when condign punishments are allotted and seen to be unavoidable by convicted criminals; then, will the Law once more be held in respect, and order return: then might our Christian faith be seen to be the best way to re-establish society, as nearly as our fallen natures on this earth will permit, to that Heavenly reflection that was Paradise.

This article was originally published last month in the 25th anniversary issue of Liverpool Newsletter. Edited by Anthony Cooney, B.A., this Social Credit journal declares itself to stand for "Faith and Homeland, Liberty and Property, Honest Money and Just Prices". A sample copy is obtainable for 40p., post paid, from Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH.

"THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO NOT KNOW"

A worrying aspect of the threat which growing crime presents to our society has been brought home to us here in Hampshire by a wad of cuttings from recent issues of South London newspapers sent by a reader. They contain certain facts on crime which, generally, have been concealed in national newspapers for fear that revealing them would subject editors and journalists to public contumely. Here are a few extracts:

"A young half-caste Rastafarian has been terrorising the women in Barnes in a series of attacks . . ." (*Richmond Herald*, 6/12/84).

"A callous burgler punched a young mother in the mouth before making his getaway from her home with a pocketful of jewellery . . . He is described as black . . ." (*Putney Chronicle*, 7/12/84).

"A 50-year-old man was attacked and robbed by youths armed with a penknife last week . . . he was set on by three coloured youths . . ." (*Richmond & Twickenham Times*, 21/12/84).

"Police are hunting a black youth who stabbed a 30-year-old Teddington policeman . . ." (*ibid.*, 4/1/85).

Mr. Roy Hattersley, without doubt, would condemn such stories as "actually proving nothing," which was his informed opinion quoted in *The Times* when Mr. Harvey Proctor raised this particular aspect of the immigration tragedy in the Commons two years ago. Indeed, the case of *The Crown versus Webster* in October 1979 would suggest that the collation of

such news and its presentation systematically to a wide readership is "racially provocative" and, therefore, itself a crime!

It was Belloc who wrote a ballade with the refrain: "But these are things that people do not know/They do not know because they are not told." If it be actionable systematically to alert the public to an issue which could usefully be occupying the minds of this country's regiments of social scientists — this was Mr. Webster's offence — let us at least alert the policy-makers in the great Departments of State who might themselves be victims of such suppression of the truth. They probably don't live in the areas concerned!

We urge readers to continue to support the initiative of *Liverpool Newsletter*, reported in January's *Candour*: viz. when you read your local newspaper, cut out reports of violent crimes (by any type of person, we would add firmly) and send them weekly to:

W. J. Bohan, Esq.,
Asst. Secretary of State,
Criminal Policy Department,
Home Office,
50 Queen Anne's Gate,
London SW1H 9AT.

It is vital that despatches arrive on Mr. Bohan's desk from all parts of the country and with irritating regularity.

THE REALITIES OF DISARMAMENT

by Hilaire du Berrier

The most important and urgent message for every American politician, editor and T.V. commentator today is: Cease calling for or promoting arms limitation talks, "detente" talks, or peaceful cohabitation talks with Soviet Russia. Politicians like Geraldine Ferraro and Walter Mondale, by promising such talks, force their opposition to do the same with the threat that they will tell the American people that the opposition does not want peace unless it makes the same promise. Any politician who promises such talks, for the sake of votes, and any editor who calls for them, is only raising unfounded hopes in American minds and leading America into quicksands. The implication is that arms limitations and other negotiations will be conducted between the American government and the Soviet. How can this lead to any solution for peace when the Soviet Communist Party *is* the Soviet Government? The same men form both; all they do is change caps. The Supreme Soviet is Russia's Parliament. The real source of power is the Central Committee of the Communist Party. In 1975, Leonid Brezhnev, speaking as head of the Soviet Government, launched a lulling drive for detente with the West. Then, speaking as secretary-general of the Soviet Communist Party, he told his countrymen: "International detente does not in any way signify the abandonment of our struggle of ideas." Read: We may promise the West peace and friendship, but this is only so we may undermine them from within.

Mr. Robert Conquest wrote in his column in the *Daily Telegraph* of December 1st, 1984: "Western leaders must not create the appearance of success in disarmament negotiations without real achievements; doing so, they would deceive their countries and, worst of all, provoke a unilateral disarmament. The danger is real because of both the tight secrecy in the socialist countries and domestic political manoeuvring of certain Western politicians, who are prepared to jeopardise the delicate global balance for transitory political situations at home." Politicians must not be forced to outdo each other with promises of "talks with Russia". The only possible talk with Russia should start: "Have whatever form of government you want, but cease your sapping operations in countries that are free. Get out of Afghanistan and stop planning expansion. Forget the Leninist theme that the revolution of 1917 was only the first step towards a communist world. Drop the Kremlin statement of policy which holds that the existence of sovereign capitalist states is only a transitory historical

phase on the way to a socialist world and that the duty of Soviet Russia is to make that transition period as short as possible."

Dimitry Manuilsky's statement of policy has been quoted *ad nauseum*: "The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record . . . The Capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to co-operate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with a clenched fist."

Once Russia renounces her policy of sapping nations from within, detente and peaceful coexistence will automatically follow. Arms limitations will no longer be a problem and the World Peace Council will no longer have to undermine the West's schools and churches, but this will not happen as long as politicians use a fright campaign to garner votes, and accuse their opponents of wanting war if they do not profess eagerness to talk to Moscow, for the sake of talking.

When President Nixon went to Moscow in the spring of 1974, chief of government Leonid Brezhnev declared: "The foreign policy course of our State is called a peace offensive. We must continue this most noble offensive in the name of the present and future of mankind." A few days later he told his own people through the official party organ, *Kommunist*: "Peaceful coexistence is a special form of class struggle. One must be prepared for the struggle to intensify into an even more acute confrontation of the two social systems."

Mrs. Ferraro, here is a lesson in foreign affairs. The only conversation with people who conned both Roosevelt and you should consist of a single sentence: Cut your embassies and trade missions down to size; call your K.G.B. agents home; quit waging war through subversive fronts, then there will be no need of arms limitations talks.

Reprinted with acknowledgements to *H du B Reports*, 20 Bld Princess Charlotte, Monte Carlo, Monaco. Published monthly. Send £1 for sample copy.

A. K. CHESTERTON ACADEMY

Candour subscribers who are interested are invited to write to us, enclosing an s.a.e., for details of our week-long "retreats" at Forest House this year, where you can enjoy a good read, feed and rest!

FATHER FAHEY — A TRIBUTE

Only after reading his books — most of which are still available in print, thankfully — does one fully realise the loss Christendom suffered by the death of Father Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., D.D., D.Ph., B.A., whose fortieth anniversary occurred last year. He had a greater understanding of the order which should exist in the world and of the forces which seek to destroy it than any of the other economists and historians of our time. Truth and justice had no more courageous champion than this brilliant Irish priest.

His first warning of the attack directed against us was given in a series of articles on the modern anti-Christian movement which he wrote for a Dublin magazine in 1928. At that time he had already been studying the subject for nearly twenty years. No one was more able for the task. For nearly forty years his main occupation was Professor of Philosophy and History in the largest missionary seminary in Ireland.

In 1931 he published his first book, *The Kingship of Christ*. This was followed four years later by a more comprehensive study, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, which did more to focus attention on the subversive activities of Judaeo-Masonry than any other book published up to then. But not till the appearance of *The Rulers of Russia* in 1938 did his work become really widely known. None of the numerous books on Russia which have been written in recent years can compare with this splendid little volume. It is by far the best account we have of the Bolshevik Revolution and Marxism, and has brought the truth about the Jewish control of Russia and Communism to thousands of people.

Heart Of The Matter

The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganisation of Society. Father Fahey's greatest work, was published just after the last war. This is a monumental study of the ills which beset the modern world, of the forces seeking to dominate it and the means for restoring order to it. No one can get to the root of present-day problems without careful consideration of this vital work, for it is the most comprehensive and penetrating investigation of the crisis of our civilisation which has yet been undertaken. His next book, *Money Manipulation and Social Order*, written shortly afterwards, is but a little less important.

No other writer dealt with these difficult subjects so convincingly as he did. This was mainly due to the amazing documentation in the accumulation of the evidence with which he always supported his

statements. Added to this, his classical training made him a fine literary craftsman, whose prose is a pleasure to read. When some worse catastrophe than we have yet experienced awakens our peoples to the activities of the powerful and ruthless forces now working secretly to enslave us, only then perhaps will Father Fahey's great work be properly appreciated..

His last two books deserve the attention of all men who wish to retain — some might say regain — their freedom. The first of these, *The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation*, is largely an account of the efforts of the Jews to dominate the world. He shows how the Jews and their allies use the term "anti-Semitism" to denote "any form of opposition to themselves" and how "they strive persistently to associate irrationality and want of balance with the term." He wrote: "They evidently want the world to believe that anyone who opposes Jewish pretensions is more or less mentally deranged . . . The situation since the Second World War is being cleverly exploited to prevent anyone from opposing Jewish aims, through fear of being dubbed an 'anti-Semite'."

The longest chapter, dealing with contemporary Jewish aims, is of absorbing interest. The principal means by which the Jews are now trying to reach their goal are, of course, Communism, Zionism and the "one world" racket. Father Fahey warns us especially of "the rise and growth of the secret Jewish power over the United States".

The title of Father Fahey's last book, *The Church and Farming*, should not mislead anyone. None of his books, in fact, should be judged by their covers, for the religious significance of many of his titles need frighten no one, as many non-Catholics can confirm. It is indeed important that farmers should study this work, since it deals — in its author's usual masterly fashion — with farming, fertilizers and food. But it is of paramount interest for the rest of us, too, for it also exposes High Finance, Hollywood, U.N.O., P.E.P., and a host of other sinister groups concealed behind well-advertised initials and all working together to make our lives a hell upon earth, as they have already done for countless millions behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. One reads his chapters on the large-scale processing of food, particularly bread, and its effect on our health as one would a thriller. He draws our attention to the revelations concerning factory-farming in the United States by two American priests, Mgr. Ligutti and Father Rawe, S.J., in their book, *Rural Roads to Security*. "Within

the past few years," they write, "the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company has become the owner of a vast agricultural empire of 1,618,000 acres. This empire contains enough land to make a farm one mile in width extending from New York to Los Angeles . . . Both Wall Street with its giant incorporated concentrations and the Government concentrations, which is Communism, move in parallel columns under similar management toward the Totalitarian State."

His great love for his fellow-men — so many of whom are duped by a servile press, radio and cinema — urged Father Denis Fahey to take up his pen and wield it tirelessly for so long in the service of truth and justice. Nothing could daunt him, not even the cowardly smear campaign his enemies unceasingly waged against him and in which so many who should have supported him so shamefully joined.

B.P.

Editor's note — In an interview in *Spearhead* in 1969, A. K. Chesterton cited Fr. Fahey as one of the greatest influences on his political thinking, along with Nesta Webster, A. N. Field and Major Clifford Douglas. So that readers unfamiliar with Fr. Fahey's work should come to know better what he stood for, we shall be publishing extracts from his books over the next few months. In the meantime, we would advise that the following titles by Fr. Fahey are available from Mr. Ronald King, 157 Vicarage Road, London E10 5DU:

The Kingship of Christ and the Conversion of the Jewish Nation, £4.50.

The Kingship of Christ and Organised Naturalism, £4.50.

Money Manipulation and the Social Order, £4.50.

The Church and Farming, £4.50.

The Mystical Body of Christ and the Reorganisation of Society, £10.

Please send payment with your order. Prices include postage to any part of the world.

MIRACLE REQUIRED

Message to all Roman Catholics

(and anybody else who likes to join in)

PRAY! PRAY! PRAY!

that the Pope and the Bishops at the Synod in November will at last consecrate Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, for Our Lady promised at Fatima in 1917 that if this is done, the world will be delivered from the scourge of Communism and there will be peace for a time.

LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE

Forty-five years on from the publication of *Rural Roads to Security*, the independent family farmer in the United States continues to face foreclosure as the giant combines slowly and surely take over more of America's agricultural production.

The following report by Nicholas Ashford "Debt and despair for the pride of America", was printed in *The Times* on January 26th.

"The small and medium-sized American farmer, traditionally the personification of American values of hard work and independence, is becoming an endangered species. Indeed, his plight has captured the imagination of Hollywood in box office hits such as *Country* and *Places in the Heart*.

"Half a century ago one American in four lived on a farm. Now, the figure is down to 3 per cent of the population and, if the farm crisis continues, it could shrink still further in the next few years.

"Nearly 1.7 million of the nation's 2.4 million farms are small, part-time operations selling less than 40,000 dollars (£35,000) a year worth of products. Many of these will either close or be gobbled up by the giant farming combines.

"Many of the 570,000 medium-sized farms are also in difficulties. Only the 100,000 big farms, selling more than 200,000 dollars worth of produce annually, seem reasonably secure.

"While most Americans are enjoying a massive economic boom, the farmers are undergoing tremendous hardship, mainly because of circumstances beyond their control.

"High interest rates, stagnating export markets (caused by the strong dollar and the indebtedness of customers in third world countries) and bumper U.S. harvests have meant that farmers are earning less for most of their crops than they cost to produce.

"Their situation is made worse by the huge debts which many of them ran up during the 1970s boom when governments of the day urged them to produce the maximum. To do this, farmers were encouraged to borrow heavily from farm banks. But as a result of the recent sharp drop in farm prices, they are four times deeper in debt than they were a decade ago."

Mr. Ashford continued his report by stating the Reagan Administration's determination to introduce "market-orientated" legislation on agricultural price-supports and abandon the subsidies that have enabled many farmers to remain in business. He concluded by predicting that "the decline of the small and medium-sized American farmer is likely to continue". Thus, the control of food, like other resources, is increasingly at the mercy of the monopolists who seek a new international economic order.

OPEN LETTER TO THE EARL OF STOCKTON

The latest batch of Cabinet papers just released under the thirty-year rule show that even in 1954 signs of alarm were expressed by Government Ministers about rising immigration from the coloured Commonwealth. A committee was appointed to consider the problem, but it was not until 1962, following an influx of 136,400 immigrants the year before, that legislative steps were taken, when Mr. Butler's Commonwealth Immigrants Act — a wholly inadequate measure — was passed, despite fierce Labour and Liberal opposition. The blame for this lamentable dereliction of duty falls squarely on the shoulders of that star of a gerontophile media, the Earl of Stockton. As Prime Minister Harold Macmillan during the late 'fifties and early 'sixties, he and his Ministers acted on one of the most hallowed and lavishly commended of Tory principles, that of "masterly inactivity", by first developing no policy for dealing with the extraordinary movement of coloured people to these isles and then approving a policy that was largely ineffective.

Candour reader Bob Huxtable, who is a member of the Monday Club of many years standing, has addressed a letter of protest to the Earl of Stockton, which we have pleasure in reproducing below.

"My Lord,

"I enclose two copies of letters published in the *Daily Telegraph* about mass immigration into this country, about which it is difficult for me to write or speak calmly. I do not know either of the gentlemen concerned, but agree with them entirely.

"I was born the son of a greengrocer in what was then the County Borough of West Ham, now part of the London Borough of Newham, where I still have relatives, and I have seen the old Cockney way of life destroyed. Also, I can bear testimony to the frustration and dismay (not to say anger) of the local people who have seen the districts in which they were born and bred, and in many cases their parents and grandparents were born and bred, turned into an outpost of Kingston, Jamaica, or a village in the Punjab. Such a state of affairs can be paralleled in all our industrial cities, of course. It was certainly not by the wish of the British people that this state has come about. They were never consulted in any way; in fact, up to the time of Enoch Powell's famous speech in April 1968 all political parties maintained a conspiracy of silence on this vital matter. It is a pity he did not speak out earlier and resign from your Cabinet over this matter than over the less important issue of government expenditure.

"For this state of affairs you were primarily responsible. You were Prime Minister from 1956 to 1961 during which time you, abetted by your henchmen Butler, Macleod and Boyle, did absolutely nothing to stem this alien tide of peoples whose habits, customs and culture are not those of the native British. The results can be seen: look at the 1981 riots, for example. When reluctantly, you did bring in the first feeble immigration bill in 1961, it was as full of as many holes as a sieve. In a far more ignoble sense, it can be said of you as was said of Sir Christopher Wren: *Si monumentum requiris circumspice*.

"There were other matters as well. Sir Roy Welensky recounts bitterly in his work *3000 Days* how you broke up the Central African Federation after having given a specific pledge that you would not do so except by mutual consent, gave independence to so-called African nations years before they were ready for it (they are all corrupt dictatorships now), and failed to reform the trade unions.

"This, I suggest, is a record to be ashamed of.

"I am, my Lord, yours faithfully,

ROBERT HUXTABLE.

SIGN OF THE AGE

"Towards the end of his life the Prof. made a remark on more than one occasion with such an air of seriousness that he seemed to regard it as his testament of wisdom, and I accordingly feel it incumbent upon me to record it here, although not in perfect sympathy with it. 'Do you know,' he asked, 'what the future historians will regard as the most important event of this age?' Well, what was it? 'It will not be Hitler and the Second World War, it will not be the release of nuclear energy, it will not be the menace of Communism.' These negatives seemed very comprehensive. He put on an expression of extreme severity and turned down the corners of his lips. 'It will be the abdication of the white man.' Then he nodded his head up and down several times to drive home his proposition."

—from *The Prof.*, by R. F. Harrod, published by Macmillan, 1959. A biography of F. A. Lindemann (Lord Cherwell), who for part of the 1939-45 War was Chief Scientific Adviser to Churchill.

THE ILLUSION OF ELECTORAL CHOICE

by NOEL HUNT

A debate is going on in our local newspaper about the sitting Member of Parliament — a “wet” Conservative, as it happens. The paper asks if the time has come to “kick out” the incumbent to make way for one “who more closely reflects the electorate’s views”. The impression is thus given that the electorate can choose a Member who reflects their views. Most people seem to think that this is so. Yet surely it is very far from being the case. Perhaps we could consider a few examples to show what we mean.

So far as we are aware no politician denies that the majority of the British people wish to see the death penalty returned to the statute book. Yet none of the three main parties will sponsor a candidate who has capital punishment as a plank in his electoral platform. Why is this? Similarly, many of the electorate would undoubtedly like to see the return of corporal punishment where appropriate. They would also like to see imprisonment made thoroughly uncomfortable for those sentenced to prison. Yet none of the parties have put up candidates supporting such changes. Why is this, if the electorate can influence the choice of candidates?

Again, there is little doubt that a fairly high percentage of the electorate feel that we should never have gone in to the Common Market, and would like to see us out of it. Electoral apathy when elections to the European Parliament come round is notorious and supports this view. Not that this massive abstention prevents for one moment the Members of the European Parliament from claiming that they have a “mandate”, of course. If the views of the electors can be reflected in their choice of a Member of Parliament, why is it that none of the parties have sponsored a candidate who is in favour of leaving the Common Market?

One knows few people who have a good word to say for the United Nations. It is certain that a very large number of people are — and let us thank the Lord for it — still sufficiently and sanely xenophobic to wish to see Britain out of the United Nations. A candidate urging such a withdrawal would be certain of a fair proportion of the votes in his constituency. Why, then, is it that no political party ever recommends such a candidate to the voters?

Why is it that no public debate on these matters is permitted? Free speech certainly exists in the sense that one may freely debate matters approved by the parties. Other topics — and they include those

mentioned above — are simply smothered out of existence. One topic which may never be debated in spite of the lively public concern about it is the multi-racial society. In spite of the incessant and increasingly frenzied efforts of the race relations industry, it is daily more apparent that a very high proportion of the electorate do not wish to live in a multi-racial society. They would welcome a return to the days when Britain was a racially homogeneous country. This fact is surely known to all politicians. Why, then, is it that none of them ever commends to the electorate a candidate holding such views; if, that is, the views of the electors matter at all?

Plus Ça Change

One would dearly like to know who or what is sufficiently powerful to dragoon those who rule our rulers into ensuring that the points of view set out above are never mentioned by any Parliamentary candidate, let alone publicly and vigorously debated as they should be. Since this is so, it seems to matter little who sits in Parliament. *Plus ça change* . . . Replacing one bland purveyor of pabulum for the proletariat with another equally bland achieves nothing — except, of course, that it ensures that the issues above are never debated. This might be what is intended. The electorate has the illusion of change and choice, but the iron grip of the liberal consensus never slackens. The faces and the parties change, but the ban on the discussion of certain matters remains in being.

What seems to be needed is some means of exerting pressure on the ruling cliques of political parties to ensure that the matters we have mentioned are debated and, if necessary, that political change follows. Unless pressure can be brought to bear nothing can be done — we know already that all parties are agreed that these matters shall not be discussed. Instead, vague generalities are put forward as a party political programme to prevent us from airing matters which it would displease our masters to have discussed.

How much pressure can be brought to bear within the framework of the existing system is a puzzle. Perhaps the only hope is a massive refusal by the electorate to vote for any candidate on the ground that none reflect the views of the public. There is little hope of this while we have universal suffrage and a sufficiency of candidates who will promise material rewards to voters who elect them to office

through state-financed welfare schemes. We pride ourselves that our system is superior to that of the U.S.S.R. because there they may only vote for an approved list of candidates. All the main political parties here are either socialist or crypto-socialist, and they are in agreement that there are subjects better not discussed by the electorate. Perhaps our system is not as superior as we think it is.

Editor's note — The revisionist historian David Irving hit the nail on the head a couple of years ago when he remarked that this country is "ruled by an oligarchy or more precisely an oligopoly, rather as the seemingly free market of soaps and detergents is in fact ruled by two giant combines". Neither of the major political groupings is democratic; neither has accurately reflected the people's will, let alone our interests. Again, we say: there should be brought into being an organisation of British patriots which would raise such a hornets' nest under the politicians that they would not dare to speak or act against the national interest.

MORNING GLORY

Decline or fall!
A minaret, so tall,
Appears in Rome;
A morning blush
Adorns St. Peter's dome.
The city hushed,
A populace bemused
Unused to the muezzin's call.
Do they detect an echo, faintly
Of the Apostle, saintly Paul?
Albeit his Epistle warned,
"Pleasing ourselves" is to be scorned.
How deep the Holy City's bow?
Next time, perhaps, the Sacred Cow?

B. E. BIGGS.

NEW CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K.	£4.50
Overseas airmail	£5.00
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	\$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

MUGABE'S BANDIT STATE

by our South African correspondent

We hear some wonderful stories of "goings-on" in Zimbabwe. Last year the Government froze all money completely and, as a result, some of the Rhodesians are being compelled to go back there, particularly those who have no work in the countries where they live and have no other income besides their interest or rents or dividends which were coming out from Zimbabwe. We have also been "invited" to invest everything we have up there in Mugabe Government Bonds at four per cent. After six years, they will start paying the interest and capital to you at the rate of one-sixth per year over a period of six years (from the seventh to the twelfth year). This is laughable! If they haven't got any money after being in charge for a mere four years, and each year has been worse than the year before, where will they get the money — interest *plus* capital — after another six years? We can all say goodbye to everything we worked and saved for!

Of course, all the civil servants are taken care of. They all still get their pensions. But private enterprise — the people who built the country, employed people, and paid taxes to keep the Government and civil servants in jobs — get nothing. Any self-employed person who organised his own pension for his old age simply has the lot taken away from him. The pattern has been the same throughout Africa.

Anyway, I would rather be here without our money than sitting in Zimbabwe with it! The tales we hear coming out of there are almost unbelievable. In Salisbury, quite a few hotels have closed down, but Mugabe is putting one up costing 65 million dollars and it will have a conference hall for the Organisation for African Unity costing nine million. Mugabe also *owns* an hotel in Switzerland. As you enter, there is a big picture of him hanging on the wall!

OBITUARIES

It is with regret that we record the passing of two long-standing and faithful readers: **John Pocock** of Dartmouth, and **W. T. Duncan** of Charleston, South Carolina.

We also acknowledge with sadness the death of **James Sawyer**, President of Richmond National Front. He had had a lung removed several years ago, but afterwards smilingly soldiered on. In 1980 he attempted to take out a summons against the terrorist Menachem Begin, who was visiting this country as Prime Minister of Israel. Jim Sawyer had served in the Palestine Police.